



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

today where individual members of the *Check List* committee will stand tomorrow. They have forgotten or ignored the fact that the Rochester Code was to give us permanent names. They have made of it a "personal preference hit-or-miss system." In the words of one of their number, they are "openly at war with their own rules." Is this uniformity? Is this "the day of law"? Is this the high road to a stable nomenclature?

Do we sincerely want uniformity, or do we prefer the tangled results of individual interpretation? If the former ideal still appeals to us, why not abandon this restless pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp? Why not honestly test the combined Berlin rule for genera and Kew rule for species? None of their opponents have given them a fair trial. Until they do can they really judge of their merits?—M. L. FERNALD, *Gray Herbarium*, June, 1901.

FLOWER VISITS OF OLIGOTROPIC BEES. III.

AMONG the oligotropic bees mentioned in BOTANICAL GAZETTE 28: 36, 215, and 30: 130, should be included: *Andrena krigiana*, which collects its pollen from *Krigia amplexicaulis*; *Entechnia taurea*, which is an oligotropic visitor of *Ipomoea pandurata*; and *Anthedon compta*, which gets its pollen exclusively from *Oenothera biennis*.

Species of *Melissodes*, which usually collect the fine pollen of *Compositae*, have their scopae dense and quite closely plumose. On the other hand, *Emphor*, *Xenoglossa* and *Entechnia*, which collect the large pollen grains of *Hibiscus lasiocarpus*, *Cucurbita pepo*, and *Ipomoea pandurata*, have their scopae quite loose and thinly plumose. The close relationship of *Anthedon* to *Melissodes*, and the fact that the male has quite plumose hairs on his hind tibiae, show that the scopae of the female have recently lost the barbs and have come to be composed of simple bristles. I have wondered why this was so, and have expected to find some peculiarity in the pollen which the bee collects. Now in *Oenothera biennis* the pollen grains are large, trilobed, and connected by cobwebby threads. This condition of the pollen makes the barbs unnecessary if they would not greatly interfere with the collection of this kind of pollen.

Andrena nasonii, mentioned in the first list, is not oligotropic.

In the *Fertilization of Flowers*, p. 570, in discussing the effect of conspicuousness of flowers in inducing insect visits, Müller says:

“The most important deduction to be drawn from them is, that in general anthophilous insects are not limited by hereditary instinct to certain flowers, but that they wander about getting their food on whatever flowers they find it. For if each insect had its own species of flower, as most caterpillars have their own particular food plant, the abundance of insect visits to the plant would not depend at all upon its conspicuousness.” Then, after mentioning the case of *Andrena florea* and *Bryonia dioica*, etc., he says: “But these insects do not form 1 per cent. of all the species that I have observed, and even of these cases the restriction is only complete in two.”

In my neighborhood, excluding the inquilines, which do not make nests, 30 per cent. of the bees are oligotropic.—CHARLES ROBERTSON, *Carlinville, Ill.*